
SUBSURFACE IMAGING OF LAVA TUBES

Roadway Applications

Publication No. FHWA-CFL/TD-05-005

September 2005



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Highway
Administration**



**Central Federal Lands Highway Division
12300 West Dakota Avenue
Lakewood, CO 80228**

FOREWORD

The Federal Lands Highway (FLH) promotes development and deployment of applied research and technology applicable to solving transportation related issues on Federal Lands. The FLH provides technology delivery, innovative solutions, recommended best practices, and related information and knowledge sharing to Federal agencies, Tribal governments, and other offices within the FHWA.

At many sites where road projects are planned by the FLH, unknown or undetected lava tubes (subsurface voids) may be present. To help quantify issues related to unknown voids, CFLHD undertook a preliminary investigation into non-invasive geophysical methods aimed at (1) characterizing the presence and vertical/horizontal extent of voids, (2) determining the most suitable geophysical methods for specifically conducting roadway surveys in terms of detection capabilities vs. feasibility (cost) vs. time constraints, and (3) identifying the range of applications nationwide

This study includes background information of multiple geophysical methods and their ability to detect voids, a review of geophysical data collected over lava tubes at Lava Beds National Monument, and the results from the data. Conclusions and recommendations for economically and accurately locating lava tubes were made.

Notice

This document is disseminated under the sponsorship of the U.S. Department of Transportation in the interest of information exchange. The U.S. Government assumes no liability for the use of the information contained in this document. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

The U.S. Government does not endorse products or manufacturers. Trademarks or manufacturers' names appear in this report only because they are considered essential to the objective of the document.

Quality Assurance Statement

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) provides high-quality information to serve Government, industry, and the public in a manner that promotes public understanding. Standards and policies are used to ensure and maximize the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of its information. FHWA periodically reviews quality issues and adjusts its programs and processes to ensure continuous quality improvement.

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No. FHWA-CFL/TD-05-005	2. Government Accession No.	3. Recipient's Catalog No.	
4. Title and Subtitle <i>Subsurface Imaging of Lava Tubes Roadway Applications</i>		5. Report Date September 2005	
		6. Performing Organization Code	
7. Author(s) Todd M. Meglich, Misti C. Williams, and Kanaan Hanna		8. Performing Organization Report No. 5007	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Blackhawk, a division of ZAPATA ENGINEERING 301 Commercial Road, Suite B Golden, CO 80401		10. Work Unit No. (TRAIS)	
		11. Contract or Grant No. DTFH68-03-P-00179	
12. Sponsoring Agency Name and Address Federal Highway Administration Central Federal Lands Highway Division 12300 W. Dakota Avenue, Suite 210 Lakewood, CO 80228		13. Type of Report and Period Covered Technical Report, 2005	
		14. Sponsoring Agency Code HFTS-16.4	
15. Supplementary Notes COTR: Khamis Haramy, FHWA CFLHD; Advisory Panel Members: Roger Surdahl, Matt Demarco, FHWA CFLHD. This project was funded under the FHWA Federal Lands Highway Technology Deployment Initiatives and Partnership Program (TDIPP).			
16. Abstract The Central Federal Lands Highway Division (CFLHD), FHWA, located in Denver, CO, is primarily responsible for the rehabilitation, reconstruction, and repaving of National Forest and Park roads in the western states region. At many sites, such as the Lava Beds National Monument (LBNM) in northern California, there are concerns that unknown near-surface voids pose possible risks to roadway construction activities, the long-term stability and maintenance of the roadway, and to public safety. To help quantify issues related to unknown voids, CFLHD undertook a preliminary investigation into non-invasive geophysical methods aimed at (1) characterizing the presence and vertical/horizontal extent of voids, (2) determining the most suitable geophysical methods for specifically conducting roadway surveys in terms of detection capabilities vs. feasibility (cost) vs. time constraints, and (3) identifying the range of applications nationwide. This report contains the details of geophysical surveys performed at the LBNM. The geophysical surveys were performed over several areas with known lava tubes. This report provides the geological site conditions, overviews of the geophysical methods, summary of the results, and overall recommendations that should be considered for future void detection.			
17. Key Words GEOPHYSICAL SURVEYS, MAGNETIC, ELECTRICAL RESISTIVITY, ELECTRICAL CONDUCTIVITY, HIGH RESOLUTION SHEAR WAVE REFLECTION, GROUND PENETRATING RADAR, VOIDS, LAVA TUBES		18. Distribution Statement No restriction. This document is available to the public from the sponsoring agency at the website http://www.cflhd.gov .	
19. Security Classif. (of this report) Unclassified	20. Security Classif. (of this page) Unclassified	21. No. of Pages 153	22. Price

SI* (MODERN METRIC) CONVERSION FACTORS				
APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS TO SI UNITS				
Symbol	When You Know	Multiply By	To Find	Symbol
LENGTH				
in	inches	25.4	millimeters	mm
ft	feet	0.305	meters	m
yd	yards	0.914	meters	m
mi	miles	1.61	kilometers	km
AREA				
in ²	square inches	645.2	square millimeters	mm ²
ft ²	square feet	0.093	square meters	m ²
yd ²	square yard	0.836	square meters	m ²
ac	acres	0.405	hectares	ha
mi ²	square miles	2.59	square kilometers	km ²
VOLUME				
fl oz	fluid ounces	29.57	milliliters	mL
gal	gallons	3.785	liters	L
ft ³	cubic feet	0.028	cubic meters	m ³
yd ³	cubic yards	0.765	cubic meters	m ³
NOTE: volumes greater than 1000 L shall be shown in m ³				
MASS				
oz	ounces	28.35	grams	g
lb	pounds	0.454	kilograms	kg
T	short tons (2000 lb)	0.907	megagrams (or "metric ton")	Mg (or "t")
TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)				
°F	Fahrenheit	5 (F-32)/9 or (F-32)/1.8	Celsius	°C
ILLUMINATION				
fc	foot-candles	10.76	lux	lx
fl	foot-Lamberts	3.426	candela/m ²	cd/m ²
FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS				
lbf	poundforce	4.45	newtons	N
lbf/in ²	poundforce per square inch	6.89	kilopascals	kPa
APPROXIMATE CONVERSIONS FROM SI UNITS				
Symbol	When You Know	Multiply By	To Find	Symbol
LENGTH				
mm	millimeters	0.039	inches	in
m	meters	3.28	feet	ft
m	meters	1.09	yards	yd
km	kilometers	0.621	miles	mi
AREA				
mm ²	square millimeters	0.0016	square inches	in ²
m ²	square meters	10.764	square feet	ft ²
m ²	square meters	1.195	square yards	yd ²
ha	hectares	2.47	acres	ac
km ²	square kilometers	0.386	square miles	mi ²
VOLUME				
mL	milliliters	0.034	fluid ounces	fl oz
L	liters	0.264	gallons	gal
m ³	cubic meters	35.314	cubic feet	ft ³
m ³	cubic meters	1.307	cubic yards	yd ³
MASS				
g	grams	0.035	ounces	oz
kg	kilograms	2.202	pounds	lb
Mg (or "t")	megagrams (or "metric ton")	1.103	short tons (2000 lb)	T
TEMPERATURE (exact degrees)				
°C	Celsius	1.8C+32	Fahrenheit	°F
ILLUMINATION				
lx	lux	0.0929	foot-candles	fc
cd/m ²	candela/m ²	0.2919	foot-Lamberts	fl
FORCE and PRESSURE or STRESS				
N	newtons	0.225	poundforce	lbf
kPa	kilopascals	0.145	poundforce per square inch	lbf/in ²

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
REPORT ORGANIZATION	3
CHAPTER 1.0. INTRODUCTION.....	5
CHAPTER 2.0. LOCATION AND GEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	7
CHAPTER 3.0. GEOPHYSICAL METHODS FOR MAPPING VOIDS.....	9
3.1 Electrical Resistivity	9
3.1.1 General Background and Data Acquisition	9
3.1.2 Advantages for Mapping Subsurface Voids	11
3.1.3 Limitations for Mapping Subsurface Voids	11
3.1.4 Case Studies for Mapping Subsurface Voids	12
3.1.5 Application of the Electrical Resistivity at LBNM.....	12
3.2 Ground Penetrating Radar.....	13
3.2.1 General Background and Data Acquisition	13
3.2.2 Advantages for Mapping Subsurface Voids	14
3.2.3 Limitations for Mapping Subsurface Voids	15
3.2.4 Case Studies for Mapping Subsurface Voids	15
3.2.5 Application of the GPR Method at LBNM.....	16
3.3 Magnetic Method.....	16
3.3.1 General Background and Data Acquisition	16
3.3.2 Advantages for Mapping Subsurface Voids	17
3.3.3 Limitations for Mapping Subsurface Voids	17
3.3.4 Case Studies for Mapping Subsurface Voids	17
3.3.5 Application of the Magnetic Method at LBNM	17
3.4 Electrical Conductivity	18
3.4.1 General Background and Data Acquisition	18
3.4.2 Advantages for Mapping Subsurface Voids	18
3.4.3 Limitations for Mapping Subsurface Voids	18
3.4.4 Case Studies for Mapping Subsurface Voids	19
3.4.5 Application of the Conductivity Method at LBNM.....	19
3.5 Seismic Refraction.....	19
3.5.1 General Background and Data Acquisition	19
3.5.2 Advantages for Mapping Subsurface Voids	21
3.5.3 Limitations for Mapping Subsurface Voids	21
3.5.4 Case Studies for Mapping Subsurface Voids	21
3.5.5 Application of Seismic Refraction at LBNM	22
3.6 Seismic Reflection.....	22
3.6.1 General Background and Data Acquisition	22
3.6.2 Advantages for Mapping Subsurface Voids	22
3.6.3 Limitations for Mapping Subsurface Voids	22
3.6.4 Case Studies for Mapping Subsurface Voids	24

3.6.5 Application of the Seismic Reflection Method at LBNM.....	24
3.7 Gravity Method	24
3.7.1 General Background and Data Acquisition	24
3.7.2 Advantages for Mapping Subsurface Voids	26
3.7.3 Limitations for Mapping Subsurface Voids	26
3.7.4 Case Studies for Mapping Subsurface Voids	26
3.7.5 Application of the Gravity Method at LBNM	26
CHAPTER 4.0. GEOPHYSICAL MAPPING OF VOIDS AT LBNM	27
4.1 General Information.....	27
4.2 Golden Dome Cave.....	30
4.2.1 Site Description.....	30
4.2.2 Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	31
4.2.3 Comparisons	39
4.3 Indian Well Cave	40
4.3.1 Site Description.....	40
4.3.2 Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	41
4.3.3 Comparisons	49
4.4 Monument Road Cave	50
4.4.1 Site Description.....	50
4.4.2 Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	52
4.4.3 Comparisons	60
4.5 Bearpaw Bridge	60
4.5.1 Site Description.....	60
4.5.2 Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	63
4.5.3 Comparisons	63
4.6 Hercules Leg Cave – Known and Unknown Sections.....	64
4.6.1 Site Description.....	64
4.6.2 Data Analysis and Interpretation.....	65
4.6.3 Comparisons	77
CHAPTER 5.0. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	79
5.1 Survey Method Evaluation.....	81
CHAPTER 6.0. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL	85
CHAPTER 7.0. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	87
7.1 Conclusion.....	87
7.2 Recommendations	87
CERTIFICATION AND DISCLAIMER	89
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	91
REFERENCES	93
APPENDIX A - PHOTOGRAPHS FROM LBNM.....	95
APPENDIX B - SURVEY PARAMETERS.....	99

APPENDIX C - GPR CROSS SECTIONS.....	102
APPENDIX D - HIGH RESOLUTION SHEAR WAVE CROSS SECTIONS.....	123
APPENDIX E - ELECTRICAL RESISTIVITY CROSS SECTIONS.....	125

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1. Map. Site Map of Lava Beds National Monument. ⁽⁴⁾	7
Figure 2. Drawing. Electrode array for measuring ground resistivities. ⁽⁷⁾	10
Figure 3. Cross Section. Data collected over a void plotted as a pseudosection. ⁽⁹⁾	11
Figure 4. Photo. Data collection with the OhmMapper.....	13
Figure 5. Drawing. Ground Penetrating Radar system over a void. ⁽⁷⁾	14
Figure 6. Screen Capture. Ground Penetrating Radar data over interpreted voids. ⁽⁷⁾	14
Figure 7. Photo. GPR data collection with the 400 MHz antenna at LBNM.....	16
Figure 8. Photo. Data collection with the Geometrics G-858 Magnetometer at LBNM.....	18
Figure 9. Photo. Data collection with the EM31 at LBNM.	20
Figure 10. Drawing. Seismic refraction data across a fracture zone. ⁽⁵⁾	20
Figure 11. Drawing. Shear waves over an air/water-filled void. ⁽⁷⁾	23
Figure 12. Cross Section. Voids interpreted from shear wave seismic data. ⁽⁷⁾	23
Figure 13. Photo. Data collection with the MicroVibrator and the Land Streamer at LBNM. ..	25
Figure 14. Drawing. Gravity field over a void. ⁽⁷⁾	25
Figure 15. Map. Cave Loop Road site (survey locations outlined in red). ⁽⁶⁾	28
Figure 16. Photo. Land Streamer deployed above Golden Dome Cave.....	31
Figure 17. Map. GPR survey lines over Golden Dome Cave. ⁽⁶⁾	32
Figure 18. Profile. GPR cross section collected over Golden Dome Cave.....	33
Figure 19. Map. Plan and profile view of magnetic data collected over Golden Dome Cave....	35
Figure 20. Map. HRSW survey line over Golden Dome Cave. ⁽⁶⁾	37
Figure 21. Cross Section. HRSW data collected over Golden Dome Cave.	39
Figure 22. Map. Comparison of anomalous zones at Golden Dome Cave.....	40
Figure 23. Photo. The entrance of Indian Well Cave.	41
Figure 24. Map. GPR survey line over Indian Well Cave. ⁽⁶⁾	41
Figure 25. Cross Section. GPR data collected over Indian Well Cave.....	42
Figure 26. Map. Plan and profile view of magnetic data collected over Indian Well Cave.	44
Figure 27. Map. Electrical Resistivity survey line over Indian Well Cave. ⁽⁶⁾	46
Figure 28. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity data collected over Indian Well Cave.....	47

Figure 29. Map. HRSW survey line over Indian Well Cave. ⁽⁶⁾	48
Figure 30. Cross Section. HRSW data collected over Indian Well Cave.	49
Figure 31. Map. Comparison of anomalous zones at Indian Well Cave.	51
Figure 32. Photo. Monument Road Cave.....	52
Figure 33. Map. GPR survey lines at Monument Road Cave. ⁽¹⁷⁾	53
Figure 34. Profile. GPR data collected along Line 3 at Monument Road Cave.	54
Figure 35. Map. Plan and profile view of magnetic data collected over Monument Road Cave.....	55
Figure 36. Map. Electrical resistivity survey line at Monument Road Cave. ⁽¹⁷⁾	56
Figure 37. Cross Section. Electrical resistivity data collected over Monument Road Cave.	57
Figure 38. Map. HRSW survey line at Monument Road Cave. ⁽¹⁷⁾	58
Figure 39. Cross Section. HRSW data collected over Monument Road Cave.	59
Figure 40. Map. Comparison of anomalous zones at Monument Road Cave.	61
Figure 41. Map. Electrical resistivity survey line on Bearpaw Bridge. ⁽⁶⁾	62
Figure 42. Photo. Bearpaw Bridge.	62
Figure 43. Cross Section. Electrical resistivity data collected on Bearpaw Bridge.	63
Figure 44. Photo. Entrance at Hercules Leg Cave.....	64
Figure 45. Map. Plan view index map of Hercules Leg Cave. ⁽⁶⁾	65
Figure 46. Map. GPR survey line over Hercules Leg Cave. ⁽⁶⁾	66
Figure 47. Cross Section. GPR data over the known section of Hercules Leg Cave.	67
Figure 48. Cross Section. GPR data over the unknown section of Hercules Leg Cave.	68
Figure 49. Map. Magnetic data collected over the known section of Hercules Leg Cave.	69
Figure 50. Map. Magnetic data collected over the unknown section of Hercules Leg Cave.	70
Figure 51. Drawing. Electrical resistivity survey line over Hercules Leg Cave. ⁽⁶⁾	71
Figure 52. Cross Section. Electrical resistivity data collected over Hercules Leg Cave.	72
Figure 53. Map. Electrical conductivity data collected over Hercules Leg Cave.	74
Figure 54. Map. HRSW survey line over Hercules Leg Cave. ⁽⁶⁾	75
Figure 55. Cross Section. HRSW data collected over Hercules Leg Cave.....	76
Figure 56. Map. Comparison of anomalous zones over Hercules Leg Cave.....	78
Figure 57. Photos. Site conditions.....	95
Figure 58. Photos. Site conditions.....	96

Figure 59. Photos. Site conditions.....	97
Figure 60. Photos. Site conditions.....	98
Figure 61. Cross Section. GPR data.....	102
Figure 62. Cross Section. GPR data.....	103
Figure 63. Cross Section. GPR data.....	104
Figure 64. Cross Section. GPR data.....	104
Figure 65. Cross Section. GPR data.....	105
Figure 66. Cross Section. GPR data.....	106
Figure 67. Cross Section. GPR data.....	106
Figure 68. Cross Section. GPR data.....	107
Figure 69. Cross Section. GPR data.....	108
Figure 70. Cross Section. GPR data.....	108
Figure 71. Cross Section. GPR data.....	109
Figure 72. Cross Section. GPR data.....	109
Figure 73. Cross Section. GPR data.....	110
Figure 74. Cross Section. GPR data.....	110
Figure 75. Cross Section. GPR data.....	111
Figure 76. Cross Section. GPR data.....	111
Figure 77. Cross Section. GPR data.....	112
Figure 78. Cross Section. GPR data.....	112
Figure 79. Cross Section. GPR data.....	113
Figure 80. Cross Section. GPR data.....	113
Figure 81. Cross Section. GPR data.....	114
Figure 82. Cross Section. GPR data.....	114
Figure 83. Cross Section. GPR data.....	115
Figure 84. Cross Section. GPR data.....	115
Figure 85. Cross Section. GPR data.....	116
Figure 86. Cross Section. GPR data.....	116
Figure 87. Cross Section. GPR data.....	117
Figure 88. Cross Section. GPR data.....	117

Figure 89. Cross Section. GPR data.	118
Figure 90. Cross Section. GPR data.	118
Figure 91. Cross Section. GPR data.	119
Figure 92. Cross Section. GPR data.	119
Figure 93. Cross Section. GPR data.	120
Figure 94. Cross Section. GPR data.	120
Figure 95. Cross Section. GPR data.	121
Figure 96. Cross Section. GPR data.	121
Figure 97. Cross Section. GPR data.	122
Figure 98. Cross Section. Uninterpreted HRSW data.	123
Figure 99. Cross Section. Uninterpreted HRSW data.	123
Figure 100. Cross Section. Uninterpreted HRSW data.	124
Figure 101. Cross Section. Uninterpreted HRSW data.	124
Figure 102. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Vertical 2-D.....	125
Figure 103. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Vertical 2-D.....	126
Figure 104. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Vertical 2-D.....	127
Figure 105. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Vertical 2-D.....	127
Figure 106. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Vertical 2-D.....	128
Figure 107. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Vertical 2-D.....	129
Figure 108. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Vertical 2-D.....	130
Figure 109. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Vertical 2-D.....	131
Figure 110. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Interpretation.	132
Figure 111. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Interpretation.	132
Figure 112. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Comparison.	133
Figure 113. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Interpretation.	133
Figure 114. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Interpretation.	134
Figure 115. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Comparison.	134
Figure 116. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Interpretation.	135
Figure 117. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Interpretation.	135
Figure 118. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Comparison.	136

Figure 119. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Interpretation.	136
Figure 120. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Interpretation.	137
Figure 121. Cross Section. Electrical Resistivity Comparison.	137

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Geophysical methods used for mapping subsurface voids at LBNM.....	28
Table 2. DGPS base station coordinates.....	29
Table 3. Cave parameters determined through surveying.	30
Table 4. GPR survey line coordinates over Golden Dome Cave.	33
Table 5. Geophone coordinate locations at Golden Dome Cave.	38
Table 6. GPR survey line coordinates over Indian Well Cave.	42
Table 7. Electrical resistivity survey line coordinates over Indian Well Cave.	46
Table 8. Geophone coordinate locations over Indian Well Cave.....	48
Table 9. GPR survey line coordinates over Monument Road Cave.....	53
Table 10. Electrical resistivity line survey coordinates over Monument Road Cave.	56
Table 11. Geophone coordinate locations over Monument Road Cave.	59
Table 12. GPR survey line coordinates over Hercules Leg Cave.	66
Table 13. Electrical resistivity survey line coordinates over Hercules Leg Cave.....	71
Table 14. Geophone coordinate locations over Hercules Leg Cave.	75
Table 15. Reference guide of the final results from the geophysical surveys at LBNM.....	82
Table 16. Geophysical survey methods' capabilities, production rates, and cost effectiveness for lava tube detection.....	83
Table 17. GPR survey parameters.	99
Table 18. Geometrics OhmMapper TR2 array parameters.....	100
Table 19. High Resolution Shear Wave reflection survey parameters.....	101

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide information on geophysical techniques to detect the presence of shallow-subsurface voids where road projects are planned. Determining subsurface conditions for road projects will significantly reduce the risk to roadway construction activities, provide improved long-term stability and maintenance of the roadway, and improve public safety. Identifying these voids will potentially preserve them from damage. It will also provide planners with information on corridor alignment to mitigate impacts.

In order to accurately and economically locate near-surface voids that may affect roadway stability, the FHWA-CFLHD in coordination with Blackhawk investigated a variety of geophysical techniques at Lava Beds National Monument (LBNM) in northern California. The main objectives were to: (a) detect the presence of subsurface voids under specific geologic settings, (b) detect and characterize the vertical/horizontal extent of the voids, (c) determine the most economical and efficient (time effective) geophysical method(s) to use during roadway site investigations, and (d) identify the range of applications of such methods nationwide.

Geophysical techniques were chosen for near-surface void detection because they are non-intrusive and cost- and time-effective methods. In general, their accuracy and resolution depend on the depth of investigation and geological factors (for most geophysical methods, resolution decreases as depth increases).

The LBNM area was chosen as the site for these investigations for the following reasons: (a) the existence of many well-mapped caves that vary both in size and depth beneath the ground surface and (b) future roadwork is planned in LBNM and the results may be beneficial to this work.

Geophysical data were collected at the site using Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR), Magnetics, High Resolution Shear Wave Seismic Reflection (HRSW), Electrical Resistivity (ER), and Electrical Conductivity methods. Each site has known underground void geometries and locations. This information was used to assess the accuracy of each applied geophysical method for void detection at LBNM.

The results of the investigation indicated that some of the geophysical methods were effective in detecting voids, while other methods were limited due to the localized geological setting and void geometries. Depending on site conditions, such as subsurface geology or void size and depth, when a combination of methods were used, there was a greater chance of effectively delineating the location and orientation of the voids. The combined GPR and magnetic methods were the most economical and least time consuming for detecting voids whose depths range between 0 to 9 m (0 to 30 ft). Magnetic surveys should be performed first as a reconnaissance tool in order to locate the position of magnetic anomalies that may indicate the presence of potential voids. A focused GPR survey would then be conducted to evaluate each magnetic anomaly and to determine the depth and lateral extent of the features.

This study includes information about the site geology, survey site descriptions, overview of the geophysical methods used, data acquisition parameters, and interpretations. The results of this study will be of interest to federal land managers who protect these types of features, highway designers, maintenance crews, geotechnical engineers, owners of roads constructed over old mine works, and utility crews; in general, whoever is interested in locating voids beneath roadways.

REPORT ORGANIZATION

The Executive Summary provides a summary of the geophysical study, results, and recommendations.

Chapter One provides a brief background on engineering problems related to the presence of voids beneath roadways and the geophysical methods used during the study.

Chapter Two outlines the regional location of the LBNM area and its geological background. The geological setting of investigative area is important when planning a geophysical survey.

Chapter Three describes the geophysical methods/techniques available to meet the study's objectives. Five geophysical methods were used at the LBNM site. The general background of the methods, data acquisition, advantages and limitations for mapping subsurface voids, and case studies for mapping subsurface voids are discussed.

Chapter Four details the geophysical surveys at LBNM. This chapter includes individual site descriptions, data analysis and interpretation, and comparisons of each method used at each site.

Chapter Five lists the results from the geophysical surveys at LBNM.

Chapter Six details the Quality Assurance and Quality Control activities performed in order to provide quality products and services.

Chapter Seven states the conclusions and recommendations derived from this report.

The certification and disclaimer, the acknowledgement, and references are listed at the end of the text.

Appendix A contains photographs from LBNM.

Appendix B lists survey parameters used at LBNM.

Appendix C contains GPR cross sections from the data collected at LBNM.

Appendix D contains electrical resistivity cross sections from the data collected at LBNM.

Appendix E contains high resolution shear wave cross sections from the data collected at LBNM.